

Minutes of the Dairy Industry Advisory Committee

Tuesday, January 11, 2011, through Wednesday, January 12, 2011

A public meeting of the Dairy Industry Advisory Committee (DIAC) was held at the USDA Headquarters, Washington, DC, on Tuesday, January 11, through Wednesday, January 12, 2011.

Committee members present included the following:

Name	State	Business
Andrew Novakovic, Chairman	NY	Cornell University
Erick Coolidge	PA	Le-Ma-Ra Farm
Paul Bourbeau	VT	Paboco Farms, Inc.
Jay Bryant	VA	Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative Association
Timothy Den Dulk	MI	Den Dulk Dairy Farm, LLC
Debora Erb	NH	Springvale Farms/Landaff Creamery, LLC
James Goodman	WI	Northwood Farm
James Krahn	OR	Oregon Dairy Farmers Association
Edward Maltby	MA	Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance
Randy Romanski	WI	(formerly) Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Robert Schupper	PA	Giant Food Stores
Manuel (Ray) Souza	CA	Mel-Delin Dairy
Patricia Stroup	CA	Nestle
Sue Taylor	CO	Leprino Foods Company, Inc.
Edward Welch	MN	Associated Milk Producers Inc.
James (Ricky) Williams	GA	Williams Dairy Trucking, Inc.
Robert Wills	WI	Cedar Grove Cheese Inc.

All officers from USDA were in attendance for all or part of the meeting, including:

Brandon Willis, Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs, Farm Service Agency,
Serving as Executive Secretary

Dana Coale, Deputy Administrator for Dairy Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service,
Serving as Alternate Executive Secretary

Solomon Whitfield, Acting Director of the Price Support Division, Farm Service Agency,
Serving as Designated Federal Official

Erin Taylor, Marketing Specialist, Agricultural Marketing Service,
Serving as Alternate Designated Federal Official

Tuesday, January 11, 2010

Call to Order and Opening Remarks, 8:05 AM

Solomon Whitfield, Designated Federal Official, called the meeting to order.

Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack

Andrew Novakovic introduced Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack and thanked him for taking time to address the committee.

Secretary Vilsack thanked the committee for their tremendous effort. He stated that, in general, agriculture is leading other sectors in economic recovery. For the dairy industry, however, there are some dark clouds on the horizon as milk production has increased. He expressed continued concern about market volatility.

He stated that USDA has examined the committee's preliminary recommendations and have already taken some actions. These include outreach for insurance products through the Risk Management Agency and a more significant outreach effort for the Department's farm credit programs.

Secretary Vilsack emphasized that it is important for the committee to reach consensus. He pointed out if Congress is presented with competing dairy policy plans, the lack of coordination could result in inaction.

Secretary Vilsack urged the committee to be cognizant of the Federal deficit and understand that there are limited resources.

Secretary Vilsack outlined three ways in which "agriculture has really paved the way for the U.S. to reclaim its status as a dominant economic power": (1) a commitment to low debt levels for farmers, (2) willingness to embrace innovation, and (3) enhancement of export opportunities. He urged the committee to be innovative in figuring out what is next for dairy.

Secretary Vilsack stated that in his conversations with members of Congress, he has also found that they are supportive of the committee's efforts. He thanked the committee for their many hours of work. He emphasized the importance of the committee meeting the deadline in completing their report and expressed a hope that changes can be made to reduce price volatility and improve profitability for dairy farmers.

Review of Final Report Recommendations, 8:20 AM

Dr. Novakovic briefly discussed a detailed motion that had been tabled at the December meeting concerning the extension of the Milk Income Loss Contract Program and margin insurance. He stated that an analysis was performed by Dr. Chuck Nicholson and Dr. Mark Stephenson relative to that proposal and copies of the analysis were provided to members.

He explained that the full committee would discuss changes to be made to the draft report, with subcommittee meetings in the afternoon to work out details of any information that needs to be added or rewritten. He has asked Patricia Stroup to edit the final report based upon changes that the committee decides upon. Sue Taylor, Ed Maltby and he would also be involved in the editing process, as the primary authors of the draft.

Randy Romanski asked for clarification concerning how the final draft incorporates the previous draft prepared by Subcommittee A, Existing Laws and Programs to Impact Dairy Farm Profitability and Milk Price Volatility. Dr. Novakovic explained that one report will be submitted by the committee that includes the content of Subcommittee A's report. This content is included in pages 15 through 81 of the draft final report. Sue Taylor pointed out that there are some substantial portions of the other subcommittees' reports that are also included within those pages. Dr. Novakovic further stated that subcommittee reports are reports to the full committee and not final, reportable products in and of themselves, unless the full committee chooses to make them so. The writers strategy has been to combining the three subcommittee reports into one

Robert Wills asked if a final vote would be required the next day, given that some recommendations are ambiguous. Dr. Novakovic stated that he believes the report needs endorsement of the committee. He said that the committee members will have a chance to suggest changes subsequent to the meeting with a final telephone conference to finalize the report.

Dr. Novakovic asked if there are any items of new business to add to the report. Ms. Erb stated that she would like a consideration of immigration issues. Mr. Wills stated that he would like consideration of programs to eradicate tuberculosis and Johne's disease from the U.S. dairy herd. Dr. Novakovic stated that these issues could be discussed in the afternoon subcommittee meetings. The committee then turned to changes to be considered in the draft report.

Paul Bourbeau made a motion, with a second by Ms. Stroup, that the recommendation, "Adopt California milk standards for fluid milk," (Recommendation 17) be reconsidered. There was considerable discussion among committee members concerning the lack of information concerning the cost to processors involved in adopting such standards and impact on smaller processors. Other members expressed concern that plants could face difficulty in acquiring the additional solids. Manuel (Ray) Souza stated that adoption of the CA fluid milk standards would result in 300 million pounds of nonfat milk solids being taken off the market annually. He was of

the opinion that this would have a positive net benefit to producers with little government expense and that to relieve concerns about costs a fortification allowance similar to what already exists in California could be provided to processors.

Edward Maltby made a motion, with a second by Ms. Erb, that the motion be tabled. The motion to table failed, with 8 voting in favor, 7 against, and 2 abstained. Mr. Wills, who had abstained from voting, made a motion that the motion to table be reconsidered. Ms. Erb seconded the motion. In another vote, the motion to table was approved, with 9 voting in favor, 6 voting against, and 1 abstaining.

Break, 9:55 AM

Review of Final Report Recommendations continued, 10:30 AM

Dr. Novakovic asked for discussion of a recommendation concerning dairy ingredients. Mr. Wills made a motion, seconded by Mr. Maltby, to accept the following recommendation, drafted by James Goodman, with friendly amendments by Mr. Goodman and Dr. Novakovic:

Milk and dairy products utilizing added protein in their production shall only use natural milk products that meet FDA Generally Recognized as Safe (GRAS) standards and shall conform with FDA legal Standards of Identity.

In the discussion, several issues of concern were raised: why the motion included only protein, possible redundancy with the motion that had already approved concerning product descriptors, questions about the designation Generally Accepted as Safe (GRAS), and whether or not the recommendation should be limited to standardized products. Mr. den Dulk made a motion, seconded by Mr. Souza, to table the recommendation. The committee was in consensus to table the motion. Dr. Novakovic asked Subcommittee B to consider the recommendation in their afternoon meeting.

Dr. Novakovic asked the committee to examine the recommendation concerning margin insurance discussed on pages 85 through 87 of the draft report. He reminded the committee that Subcommittee C) had proposed a similar recommendation that included greater details at the last meeting. Since that meeting, Dr. Chuck Nicholson had performed some analysis with respect to the detailed proposal. The analysis assumed that the current Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) Program, the Dairy Export Incentive Program (DEIP) and the Dairy Product Price Support Program (DPPSP) would be eliminated with the budget savings being used in the proposed margin insurance program. He discussed Dr. Nicholson's analysis, pointing out that the overall benefits to farmers and government costs for the recommendation come close to that of the MILC program. Several scenarios were analyzed and results differed depending upon farm size

and the amount of assistance provided. Committee members raised questions about the analysis that needed further clarification. Dr. Novakovic stated that he would do his best to find answers. He referred the proposal to Subcommittee C to consider the recommendation in their afternoon subcommittee meeting.

Dr. Novakovic then turned to discussion of changes to pages 1 through 57, the portion of the draft that mostly covers the content of the previous report by Subcommittee A.

Ms. Taylor stated that on page 4, line 24, “should” needs to be changed to “may.” Ms. Stroup pointed out that this change had already been approved at the last meeting. Dr. Novakovic agreed.

Ms. Taylor drew the attention of the committee to page 24, lines 19 and 20, asking why non-milk income is subtracted in the formula to determine adjusted gross margin. Dr. Novakovic suggested that the wording be changed to “non-dairy income.” Mr. Maltby agreed.

Ms. Taylor asked if the term “rate of return on assets,” discussed on page 25, should be changed to turnover ratio. She said that she would do some checking into this matter.

Mr. Wills believed that many of the definitions and discussions in the report are academic and are a barrier to reading the report. He mentioned, for example, the discussion of volatility at the top of page 19 has a phrase indicating that marketwide pools ensure that farmers do not “destructively compete.” It does not, however, explain what is meant by “destructively compete.” He would like to simplify the presentation as it was in the Subcommittee A report. The committee had mixed opinions concerning whether the definitions should be contained in the final report.

Dr. Novakovic drew the attention of the committee to pages 63 and 71. The recommendation on page 71 states, “The Secretary should develop a system of triggers and actions to guide his choices for special and emergency interventions, using existing programs.” On page 63 he added a recommendation note concerning threshold levels that are based on the work of Subcommittee B. This recommendation note goes along with the recommendation on page 71. He indicated that he added the specific threshold cash flow coverage ratio levels of 1 and 0.5. He made the point that this recommendation note makes use of definitions that were established earlier in the report. A consensus was reached that some of the definitions should remain because it provides readers with a common vocabulary.

There was some discussion about the level of detail in the report. Some committee members expressed support for the detailed content while others were of the opinion that the report could be streamlined and that some of the details could be moved to an appendix.

Mr. Goodman referred to page 23, line 3, asking if the committee needs to clarify what is meant by a “fair milk price.” Dr. Novakovic stated that he does not know if the committee can determine a fair milk price, but there is a cash flow coverage threshold discussion on page 63. There are other measures that can be used, but it is difficult to define a fair level. After some discussion, Dr. Novakovic stated that it would probably be best to have the subcommittees look at this issue.

There was considerable discussion among committee members concerning the discussion of Economic Research Service (ERS) cost of production data on pages 29 through 36. Some committee members questioned the value placed on the opportunity costs of unpaid labor and the relevance of the section in advancing the purposes of the committee. Others members were of the opinion that income and unpaid family labor should be addressed because unpaid farm labor is disappearing.

Mr. den Dulk expressed concern that the cost of production data is outdated. He stated that recent trends show increased production in the Upper Midwest while decreased production in other areas of the country. Mr. Coolidge said that the cost of production data illustrates what is occurring on the labor side of production and was of the opinion that it should remain in the report.

Ms. Taylor questioned some of the writing regarding economies of scale (page 32) and the negative environmental impacts of larger dairies. Mr. Romanski agreed and noted that because of efficiencies, larger operations are better able to address environmental concerns.

Lunch, 12:00 noon

Review of Final Report Recommendations continued, 1:15 PM

Dr. Novakovic drew the committee’s attention to the section titled Current Legislative and Regulatory Authorities starting on page 36. He summarized the recommendations and explained that this section draws heavily from the previous report drafted by Subcommittee A.

He explained that he had boxed the committee recommendations to make the report more readable, and he added some boxed recommendation notes in certain instances—for example, where the report refers to other parts of the report. Several members expressed their support of these changes.

Dr. Novakovic stated that while the committee had been on break, he had examined the Farm Credit East Business Analysis. Their analysis includes a table concerning return on equity for

dairy farms. Dr. Novakovic stated that Mr. Maltby had previously mentioned a return on equity of 5 percent as a possible benchmark for a desirable level of profitability. He believes that this would be consistent with the Farm Credit Business Analysis data and that a discussion of this could fit in the report.

Ms. Stroup had concerns about the specific numbers concerning threshold levels for cash flow ratios in the Recommendation Note on page 63. She would rather see general information provided rather than specific figures. There was discussion among the members both in support of and against referring to specific threshold levels in the report. There was some discussion about whether or not to include a milk-feed ratio or milk-feed margin. Ms. Stroup added that the committee had purposely left out specific trigger measures because they lack the expertise to pick the correct measurement. Other members stated that the possible trigger measures outlined in the report do not all have the same timeframe – some are monthly, others annual. This could lead to confusion on how often the Secretary should assess the dairy industry situation.

Ms. Stroup asked about the procedure to use for sections of the report for which the committee has not made a clear decision. Dr. Novakovic suggested that each committee member review the report after the meeting and make judicious notes concerning changes that they recommend. Ms. Stroup and Dr. Novakovic, and perhaps with Ms. Taylor and Mr. Maltby, will cooperate in figuring out areas of consensus and edits that need to be made.

Mr. den Dulk stated that the wording concerning profit and cash flow on pages 26 and 66 does not make sense. He objects to the wording that farms can have a positive cash flow but not be profitable and vice versa. He believes that such references should be stricken. Mr. Bourbeau pointed out that a farm can have a healthy-looking balance sheet due to land value but a negative cash flow.

The committee moved to a discussion of the section on New Programs, Legislation, and Regulation beginning on page 73.

Mr. Goodman asked why there was no discussion of the Specter-Casey legislation in the report. Dr. Novakovic explained that the Specter-Casey bill would use the Federal order system to establish prices based upon the cost of production and would constrain growth. Mr. Goodman said he would like the report to include some discussion of the bill.

There was some discussion among committee members concerning the amount of language in the report about growth management programs. Mr. Welch believes that there is too much detail concerning growth management programs in Appendix B and that the language is biased.

Mr. Wills stated that he believes that a discussion concerning the elimination of the Dairy Export Incentive Program be included in the discussion of the margin insurance recommendation. He believes that there should be stronger discussion in the section concerning the DPPSP about the risks involved if these programs were to end. He said that the report should be clear that these programs should be eliminated only if better alternatives are put in place. Other committee members expressed support for this position. There was some discussion about including what the implications would be of eliminating current programs.

Ms. Taylor stated that it may be beneficial to move some of the earlier discussion about Federal orders to the discussion of Recommendation 7. Committee members expressed differing opinions about how merits of the Federal order program should be discussed.

The committee members discussed the growth management recommendation (pages 75-82). Dr. Novakovic explained that he combined language from the drafts prepared by Subcommittees B and C for that section. There was some discussion about the difficulties the committee had with coming up with a more specific recommendation.

There was also discussion about whether or not a vote count should be included in the report, and if so, where the vote counts would show up in the report. Dr. Novakovic stated that, at a minimum, a vote on the overall report would be recorded. Committee members expressed various opinions. Another option expressed by some members was to include a discussion of opposing viewpoints in the report. Mr. Bourbeau offered language addressing the division of the committee on the issue of growth management. Dr. Novakovic asked him to provide the language to Ms. Stroup for consideration in the final report.

Adjourn Public Meeting, 4:00 PM

Wednesday, January 12, 2011

Call to Order and Opening Remarks, 8:05 AM

Solomon Whitfield called the meeting to order.

Dr. Novakovic began by explaining plans for discussing the remainder of the document and setting a timetable for finishing the report.

Ms. Taylor discussed portions of the report that contained recommendations that had been proposed by Subcommittee B. In reference to Recommendation 13 to modify the MILC program and provide a margin insurance program, the committee discussed a tabled motion that contained more specifics. Dr. Novakovic discussed an analysis by Dr. Chuck Nicholson with

respect to the more specific proposal. The analysis revealed that, given the specific parameters that had been included in the tabled motion by Subcommittee B, net farm operating income did not increase for any farm size under any scenario analyzed. Based on this analysis, Dr. Novakovic recommended that the report discuss the margin insurance recommendation qualitatively rather than provide specific parameters.

Mr. Maltby stated that he believes that the report should say more about the benefits of MILC. There were differing opinions between committee members concerning the present MILC program and its differential impact on dairy farms by herd size.

Some members said that the report should clarify that they are recommending the continuation of the MILC program with a change in the trigger mechanism. Other members were of the opinion that the recommendation passed was to eliminate the MILC program and support the adoption of a margin insurance program in its place. Ms. Erb stated that a motion tabled at the December meeting was an attempt to design a margin insurance program that mimicked the MILC program, not to keep the current MILC program and put in an insurance program for large farms. Dr. Novakovic and others observed that the foregoing discussion did not involve disagreement about the substance of the proposal, it only involved a debate about retaining the name of the Milk Income Loss Contract program.

Mr. den Dulk expressed concerns that the margin insurance recommendation does not refer to an index for inflation.

Dr. Novakovic suggested that the recommendation be left as is with a discussion of the pros and cons of the program. He suggested this as a subject that committee members could include in their edits after the meeting.

Mr. Wills made a motion, with a second by Mr. Bourbeau, that the words “and DEIP” be added after “elimination of DPPSP” in Recommendation 13 on page 88. The committee voted in favor of the motion: 16 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstaining.

Mr. Bourbeau stated that he received feedback from fellow dairy farmers regarding the farm savings account recommendation. He said there is concern about the time frame for withdrawing money from the program, in particular whether it would be used as an operating cash reserve or more as a retirement account. Dr. Novakovic explained that the farm savings account concept is sometimes criticized when people consider a somewhat similar Canadian program. He believes that the Canadian program differs from the recommendation in two ways: (1) Farmers were not as likely to withdraw money because Canadian agricultural policy offers many other ways for farmers to be supported, and (2) the Canadian system made it difficult for farmers to withdraw the money. Dr. Novakovic, by contrast, envisions a system where farmers can deposit or

withdraw money whenever they choose. Some of the committee members expressed that they were not concerned about when farmers would choose to withdraw the money.

Mr. Maltby discussed a portion of the report that contained recommendations that had been proposed by Subcommittee B.

Ms. Taylor questioned the relevance of the WTO issues discussed on page 100 and stated that the issues are much more complex than described.

Concerning the discussion of Recommendation 14 to lower the somatic cell count standard, Ms. Taylor recommended deletion of the sentence on page 103, line 16, concerning balancing trade benefits with increased costs on State food safety agencies. She believed this is outside of the scope of the committee's role. Also, she stated that the discussion should indicate that the U.S. should have flexibility in the standard that is equivalent to that contained in the European Union's standard.

Mr. Coolidge made a motion, with a second by Mr. Maltby, that recommendation 17 be replaced with the following recommendation:

EXPLORE ENHANCED FLUID MILK STANDARDS. Encourage the Secretary to explore the impacts of California-type fortification standards for U.S. beverage milk.

Discussion of the substitute recommendation centered on the uncertainties that had become evident about the cost and benefits of changing U.S. fluid milk standards, while at the same time believing that the proposal was worth further consideration. The committee voted unanimously in favor of the motion: 17 for, 0 against.

Concerning Recommendation 20, "PROVIDE INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES," there was considerable discussion among the committee members concerning language of the recommendation and the tone of the discussion. Mr. Maltby stated that he had wished there had been more time to consider impacts, including multiplier effects. Mr. Wills stated that he was confused by the language in the recommendation and that the discussion in the draft did not seem to be limited to environmental benefits.

Ms. Taylor stated that some of the discussion could be moved to the discussion of Recommendation 21 concerning the Environment Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and grant programs. Ms. Stroup stated that she believed that the tone of the section needed to be changed because it seemed to favor small farms. Dr. Novakovic asked the committee to consider whether the conclusion on page 116 captures what the committee was trying to achieve. Ms. Erb stated that she would like a couple of additional paragraphs added about environmental issues affecting dairy farmers across the country. Mr. den Dulk questioned whether the section was concerned with environmental incentives or social engineering. Mr. Bryant was of the opinion that there

should be less discussion concerning rural lifestyle and instead more focus on environmental issues. Mr. Romanski said this recommendation should include a section to consider farms of all sizes, a discussion of technical issues such as manure digesters, and a discussion of maintaining farmland areas. Mr. Goodman stated that social aspects cannot be separated from environmental aspects.

Mr. Wills, with a second by Mr. Goodman, made a motion that the words “environmental practices that address” be stricken from Recommendation 20. After some discussion, Mr. Wills withdrew the motion since there did not seem to be support among committee members. However, he stated that the discussion needs to clearly discuss environmental practices since the committee has decided to leave the recommendation as it is. Mr. Goodman stated that he believes multi-functionality (the policy concept that support for agriculture achieves more than one beneficial outcome) is applicable to the recommendation.

In reference to Recommendation 21 concerning EQIP and grant programs, Mr. Krahn stated that Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 590 regulations have changed recently, making it more difficult for dairy farmers to receive assistance. Dr. Novakovic asked Mr. Krahn to provide the committee with a paragraph about his concerns.

Ms. Stroup stated that she is not comfortable with the quotations in the report from people that did not address the committee. Dr. Novakovic pointed out that there are some quotes that are a matter of public record, such as from Senate Banking Committee hearings. She said she is not opposed to quotes that are a matter of public record.

There were several comments concerning the drafted discussion of Recommendation 22 to phase out ethanol subsidies. Mr. Romanski stated that he may supply some language related to future trends in the ethanol industry. Mr. Wills stated that he believes the discussion of a “closed-loop system” on page 124, line 20, needs to be taken out, stating that there are some examples of closed-loop systems that have not worked out well. Ms. Stroup stated that the committee needs to be careful in advocating a completely free market for corn while at the same time recommending government intervention for dairy. Mr. den Dulk, Mr. Bourbeau, and Dr. Novakovic expressed support for including some discussion about mandates in addition to the blender’s credit and tariff.

The committee then turned to new business with respect to proposals developed by the subcommittees on the previous day. The following actions regarding recommendations were taken by the committee:

Motion by Ms. Stroup, on behalf of Subcommittee B, second by Mr. Maltby

DAIRY HERD HEALTH. Create a program to rapidly eradicate TB and Johne's from the U.S. dairy herd.

Passed: 17 for, 0 against, 0 abstaining

Motion by Mr. Bourbeau, second by Mr. Souza

DAIRY LABOR ISSUES. The Secretary of Agriculture should use his influence with other agencies and Congress to provide legal means for dairy farms to employ year-round long-term immigrant labor. Provide assurance that existing farm-laborers have the opportunity to obtain permanent resident status.

Passed: 13 for, 1 opposed, 3 abstaining

(Note: There were several friendly amendments that revised the language of the recommendation. There was considerable discussion, including whether or not to include language concerning citizenship status and fair treatment of immigrant laborers. Members who questioned this made it clear that they were not opposed to the practice of fair treatment or the potential to pursue citizenship, but they were not sure that this was necessary or appropriate in the recommendation.)

Motion by Mr. Bourbeau, second by Mr. Schupper (recommendation prepared by Subcommittee B)

Milk and dairy products utilizing added protein in their production shall use natural milk ingredients in the fortification process.

Motion withdrawn by Mr. Bourbeau: There was discussion among committee members that the language of the motion was ambiguous and that the concerns that brought about the motion could be included in the discussion of Recommendation 18 to restrict the use of descriptors on product labels.

Motion by Ms. Stroup on behalf of Subcommittee B, second by Mr. Bourbeau, to replace Recommendation 1 on page 43 and Recommendation 7 on page 73 with the following:

Review Federal Milk Marketing Orders. The Secretary of Agriculture should appoint a committee to review implications of Federal Milk Marketing Orders, including, but not limited to end-product pricing's impact on milk price volatility and the impact of classified pricing and pooling on processing investment, competition and dairy product innovation.

Passed: 17 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstain

Motion by Ms. Taylor, second by Ms. Stroup, with a friendly amendment by Mr. Goodman

USDA, through its regulatory authority and in cooperation with the Federal Trade Commission and the U.S. Department of Justice, should continue to monitor and support competitive marketing structures throughout the supply and marketing chain of the dairy industry.

Passed: 17 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstain

Note: Mr. den Dulk pointed out that there are competitive issues related to both cooperatives and to private companies. He asked if the recommendation should reflect this. Dr. Novakovic responded that he believes these issues should be reflected in the discussion of the recommendation.

Dr. Novakovic asked for discussion from committee members concerning how the growth management proposal should be discussed and whether or not the vote count should be reported. Mr. Wills, Ms. Stroup, Mr. Maltby, Mr. Bryant, and Mr. den Dulk expressed their opinions that the discussion of the growth management proposal was too long. Mr. Welch, Mr. Bryant, Ms. Stroup, Ms. Erb, Mr. Bourbeau each stated that they believe that the vote count should be shown for each recommendation.

Dr. Novakovic discussed the following tentative schedule for completing the report:

Jan. 13 – 17:	Each committee member prepares comments for the writers to review.
Jan. 17 – 21:	Writers review comments submitted by committee members.
Jan. 21 – Feb. 1:	Writers make minor and major changes and also write some new language for some sections.
Feb. 1 – Feb. 4:	Each committee member provides a review of what has been written.
Feb. 4 – Feb. 6:	Committee members react to each other's reviews.
Feb. 11:	Conference Call

Dana Coale stated that the date for the meeting and final vote will be published in the Federal Register.

Dr. Novakovic, on behalf of the committee, thanked USDA staff for help with the effort, including Brandon Willis, Dana Coale, Solomon Whitfield, Larry Salathe, Will Francis, Milt Madison, Joy Harwood, Jerry Cessna and Erin Taylor. Mr. Coolidge thanked Dr. Novakovic for his guidance. Mr. Willis thanked Dr. Novakovic and Mr. Coolidge for their efforts.

Adjournment, 12:00 noon